

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 03 2007

**REMARKS**

This amendment is offered in response to the Office Action of July 17, 2006. Upon entry of this amendment, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above referenced application. Claims 1-18 remain in the application. Claims 1, 7 and 13 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found in the original specification, claims and/or figures. In this regard, no new matter has been introduced.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 7 and 13 are rejected by the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, Applicant has amended claims 7 and 13. Claims 7 and 13 (as amended) include storing selected entries which is a tangible result, and not a manipulation of an abstract idea or a performance of a purely mathematical algorithm. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 101 rejection be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 4, 6-7, 9, 12-13, 15 and 18 are rejected by the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eldredge et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,697,801 (*Eldredge*) in view of Prassad et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,765,164 (*Prassad*). In response, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of such claims.

Applicant's claim 1, as amended, recites in pertinent part, storing only the selected entries and not all the entries in the index file. *Eldredge*, however, neither discloses nor suggests this element of claim 1. In fact, *Eldredge* teaches away from this element, by teaching that all the entities and their corresponding values are stored, as opposed to storing only select entries. See *Eldredge*, Col 3, Lines 57-59.

Applicant notes that *Prassad* is not cited as curing, and does not cure, the above deficiency of *Eldredge* as applied to, e.g., rejected claim 1. Thus, without the need to further characterize *Prassad*, and without adopting the characterization found in the Action, Applicant respectfully asserts that rejected claim 1 is, indeed, patentable over the *Eldredge* and *Prassad* combination of references.

By the same argument as made above for claim 1, claims 7 and 13, each of which includes the same element discussed above for claim 1, are not taught or suggested by the *Eldredge* and *Prassad* combination of references. Furthermore, based at least on their dependency, claims 4 and 6 which depend on claim 1, claims 9 and 12 which depend on claim 7, and claims 15 and 18 which depend on claim 13 are not taught nor suggested by the *Eldredge* and *Prassad* combination of references.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 4, 6-7, 9, 12-13, 15 and 18 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-3, 5, 8, 10-11, 14 and 16-17 are rejected by the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the (*Eldredge*) and (*Prassad*) combination and further in view of Brent A. Miller et al., "Home Networking with Universal Plug and Play" (*Miller*). In response, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of such claims.

As mentioned above, the *Eldredge* and *Prassad* combination of references does not teach or suggest the element of storing only the selected entries and not all the entries in the index file. Applicant notes that *Miller* is not cited as curing, and does not cure, such deficiencies of the *Leyda* and *Prassad* combination of references as applied to claims 2-3, 5, 8, 10-11, 14 and 16-17. Thus, without the need to further characterize *Miller*, and without adopting the characterization found in the Action, Applicant respectfully asserts that rejected claims 2-3, 5, 8, 10-11, 14 and

16-17 are, indeed, patentable over the *Leyda* and *Prassad* and *Miller* combination of references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the § 103(a) rejection of claims 2-3, 5, 8, 10-11, 14 and 16-17 be withdrawn.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 03 2007

**Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-18 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
Nelson F. Kidd et al.

Date: May 3, 2007

/David L. Guglielmi Reg. No. 55,229/  
David L. Guglielmi  
Reg. No. 55,229  
Attorney for Applicant

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(503) 684-6200